DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 189 202 UD 020 315

AUTHOR	Carney, M., Ed.: And Others
TITLE	Inservice Training in Desegregated School Districts: Eastern Region Case Studies.
INSTITUTION	Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	Rand-N-1251-NIE
PUB DATE	Aug 79
CONTRACT	400-78-0068
NOTE	71p.: Not available in paper copy due to institution's restriction. For a related document see UD 020 313.
AVAILABLE FROM	The Rand Corporation, Publications Department, 1700 Main Street, Santa Monica, CA 90406 ($5.00).
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrators: Case Studies: Desegregation Methods: Elementary Secondary Education: *Inservice Education: *Program Effectiveness: Program Implementation: *School Desegregation: School Districts: *Staff Development: Teachers

ABSTRACT

This report describes inservice training programs in six eastern United States school districts. The districts range in student population from 4,400 to 65,000 and initially desegregated between 1970 and 1978. A team of investigators visited each of the districts and interviewed approximately 40 administrators, inservice trainers, and training program participants. A case study was prepared for each district providing (1) a brief description of the locality and desegregation plan as a context within which the inservice training programs operate, (2) an overview of the district's major inservice programs, (3) an account of the inservice planning procedures, (4) and a discussion of the impact and/or outcomes of the programs as determined through the field interviews and the impressions of the field study team members. (Author/MK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED189202

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Rand Corp.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The work upon which this publication is based was performed pursuant to Contract No. 400-78-0068 with the National Institute of Education. The opinions and conclusions expressed herein are solely those of the author, and should not be construed as representing the opinions or policy of any agency of the United States Government.

The Rand Publications Series: The Report is the principal publication documenting and transmitting Rand's major research findings and final research results. The Rand Note reports other outputs of sponsored research for general distribution. Publications of The Rand Corporation do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policies of the sponsors of Rand research.

Published by The Rand Corporation

PREFACE

This Note contains case studies from the first national study of inservice training programs in desegregated school districts. The research is sponsored by the National Institute of Education under Contract 400-78-0068-HEW, with Nicelma King as the study director. The study has two goals.

1. *To describe the process of staff development as an organizational response to school desegregation:* Who has been involved in the training programs? Who are the decisionmakers? How is the training delivered? How has it been received? Is it related to particular desegregation-oriented problems?
2. *To propose hypotheses that will be instrumental to further study of the role of staff development in the desegregation process.*

These case studies are helpful in achieving the first of these goals: describing the process of staff development. Written at the conclusion of the fieldwork of the study, they are an interim product that will be used in producing the final study report.

The study included fieldwork in sixteen districts located in the East, Midwest, and West. The sites were purposely selected as successfully desegregated districts which fit into various categories of size, stage of desegregation, and method of staff development. A reputational approach for selecting successful school districts was used; the selections being made from a pool of nominations solicited from nationally recognized desegregation experts. The districts ranged in student population between 4,400 and 65,000, and all had desegregated between 1970 and 1978.

Teams of interviewers were sent to each of the sixteen school districts. Interviews were held in the district's central administrative offices, the local school board, the community, the inservice training organizations, and several schools. The interviewers attempted to identify participants in each of the training programs, as well as individuals who planned and designed the programs. Attempts were also made to determine how the training was delivered and how it was received, and to establish the relationship of training to the desegregation effort.

A case study was prepared for each district. It provides a brief description of the locality and desegregation plan as a context within which the inservice training programs operate, an overview of the district's major inservice programs, an account of the inservice planning procedures, and a discussion of the impact or outcomes of the inservice programs as determined through field interviews and the impressions of the field study team. For purposes of confidentiality, fictitious district names are used in all case studies.

There are several reasons for publication of the case studies apart from the final report: It is expected that this material will be helpful to staffs of other desegregating districts by providing a dispassionate description of the desegregation process in selected school districts. In-district and out-of-district trainers should find the contents useful in planning desegregation-related staff development programs. The studies can be used in determining how program funds for desegregation-related inservice training are being allocated. In addition, the material can be used to establish a basis for the formation of exploratory hypotheses concerning desegregation-related staff development programs.

SUMMARY

This note describes the inservice training programs in six eastern school districts. The districts range in student population from 4,400 to 65,000 and initially desegregated between 1970 and 1978. A team of interviewers visited each of the districts and interviewed approximately 40 administrators, inservice trainers, and training program participants. A case study was prepared for each district providing a brief description of the locality and desegregation plan as a context within which the inservice training programs operate, an overview of the district's major inservice programs, an account of the inservice planning procedures, and a discussion of the impact and/or outcomes of the inservice programs as determined through field interviews and the impressions of the field study team. The case studies constitute one part of the data collected during the site visits. Additional data gathered from the interviews will permit further analysis of specific training programs and the responses of trainers and participants to these programs. A final report for the study will incorporate data from the case studies and from the detailed interview responses.

GLOSSARY

The following are acronyms which appear in the case studies:

DAC — Desegregation Assistance Center, formerly *GAC*, or General Assistance Center, funded by *TITLE IV* of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

ESEA — Elementary and Secondary Education Act, commonly associated with *TITLE I*, compensatory education programs, and *TITLE IV C*, dissemination programs.

ESAA — Emergency School Aid Act. A program which is intended to assist desegregating school districts with problems occasioned by desegregation. Also known as *TITLE 7* because it was funded as *TITLE 7* of the Education Amendments of 1974.

LEA — Local Education Agency, usually a school district.

OCR — The Office for Civil Rights in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

SEA — State Education Agency. May refer to the entire agency, or specifically to the unit within the agency created to provide desegregation-related technical assistance.

TI — Training Institute to assist school personnel with staff development problems associated with desegregation (RACE) or sex discrimination (SEX). Both types of institutes are funded by *TITLE IV* of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

USOE — United States Office of Education.

Banton School District
Eastern Region

Meg Gwaltney

INTRODUCTION

Banton is an industrial city in the Northeast. Very little new development has occurred in the city. The downtown area and the surrounding residential areas exhibit an old character, with many of the houses having been built before 1940. The community is a conservative and parochial one. Few residents are wealthy. Per capita income in 1970 was $4,123; median family income was $9,241. Only a little more than half of the population has completed high school.

Like many other cities in the Northeast, Banton has seen its population drop almost 8 percent since 1970--from 197,000 to just under 181,000. Despite this overall decline in the population, the percentage (and absolute number) of blacks in the city has increased. In 1970, only 10.8 percent of the population was black; in 1976, this figure had risen to 16 percent. The numbers of other minorities are too small to be significant.

The school population has followed a similar pattern. In the 1970-1971 school year, 29,000 students were attending the Banton public schools. Currently, the enrollment is around 22,500, the largest decline in students having occurred in the elementary grades. The percentage of black students has increased from 24.2 percent in 1970-1971 to 30.8 percent in the 1976-1977 school year.

The 22,500 students in the public schools attend 22 elementary schools (grades K-6), eight junior high schools (grades 7-9), and four high schools (grades 10-12). Approximately 1,500 professional staff members are employed by the district, 1,300 of whom are either classroom teachers or teacher assistants. Just under 10 percent of the district's teachers are black.

DESEGREGATION BACKGROUND

The district's public schools were never totally segregated; most neighborhoods in the city had both black and white families. Yet full integration was never present. In March 1975, the Urban League filed

a suit against the Banton School District, claiming that the district's elementary and junior high schools were not adequately integrated. The suit also stated that the district had not sufficiently increased the number of black teachers within the school system and that lower test scores in predominantly black schools were indications that "educational inadequacy" existed.

The district resisted the charge. Although a special census the previous year supported the Urban League's accusation of segregation (23 of the district's 44 schools were racially imbalanced in December 1974), the district argued that it was moving ahead on desegregation. It was a process that could not be completed by fall 1975 as the Urban League wished. Nevertheless, the State Education Commissioner agreed with the Urban League, and in March 1976 the Commissioner gave Banton the order to desegregate its schools. The Board of Education appointed a 26-member committee, composed of representatives of the community, to discuss alternative plans for desegregating the city's public schools. In May, the Board sent a plan to the State Commissioner which combined the features of four plans that had been proposed by the committee. Beginning in September 1976, the Board stated, the district would implement a citywide voluntary transfer program and a pilot mandatory busing program for three schools. The Board also proposed the closing of ten elementary schools, thus facilitating the natural integration of students.

Community opposition to mandatory busing of students grew, and in January 1977, the Board voted to abandon the mandatory portion of the plan. At the start of the 1977-1978 school year, the district adopted a "quadrant plan" that relied entirely on voluntary transfers of students. The new plan called for the division of the district into four zones. Students were permitted to transfer to any other school within their home zone if the transfer would promote the racial balance of the receiving school and not worsen the racial balance in the sending school--i.e., if the minority population in the two schools would not exceed 45 percent or drop below 15 percent because of the transfer.

The popularity of the transfer program grew under a promotional campaign by the district. During the first year of the transfer

program, 1976-1977, 533 students transferred voluntarily. This number more than doubled during the second year; 654 white students and 526 black students chose to attend non-neighborhood schools. At the beginning of the 1978-1979 school year, only one school remained racially imbalanced; 96 percent of the students were attending fully integrated schools. Of the 11,500 elementary school students in the district, approximately one-fifth of these students were attending schools outside of their own neighborhoods.

OVERVIEW OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

The district offers three types of staff development--superintendent's conference days, general inservice education, and staff development for desegregation. Each type differs in its goals, planning procedures, funding sources, and administrative responsibility.

Superintendent's conference days are held twice a year. Although the general objectives of the two days are set by the superintendent and his deputy, the emphasis of the inservice is on building needs. An inservice committee meets at each school to discuss needs and design workshops that are tailored to the special needs of the staff. The days are scheduled during regular school time, and every member of the professional staff is required to attend. No special stipend is given; teachers receive their salaries as they would for any other day.

The district also offers general inservice education. In 1971, the Banton Teachers' Association told the Board of Education that it wanted additional programs that would allow teachers to accumulate inservice credits and to advance on the salary scale. In response, the district formed an inservice committee, composed of teachers and central office staff. The committee meets three times a year, under the direction of the director of elementary and secondary education, to review proposals for inservice courses and to choose those that it will recommend to the Board of Education. Approximately fifteen courses are offered during the fall and spring semesters and during the summer. A professional staff member may take one course per semester. Some courses require participants to buy materials, but all of the courses are free. Funding for the general inservice program comes from the

teachers' association and from general district funds.* One and a half inservice credits are given for every 15 hours of class time. Upon the accumulation of six credits, a staff member becomes eligible to advance on the salary scale.

Courses that are offered under the general inservice program are intended to provide professional growth. The courses cover a variety of topics. Courses offered in the spring of 1979 included one on preventing drug abuse through increased human interaction, one on fiber arts, one on cnisanbop, and one on television production in the classroom. The district uses instructors from its own staff, as well as people from the community. The courses are generally offered after the school day for two or three hours; a few courses are held on Saturdays. The instructor is required to evaluate the impact of the course on the participants. This evaluation is done through pre- and post-instruments developed by the instructor.

The district provides desegregation-related inservice through a grant under ESAA. Funding for this program began in the fall of 1977, one year after the district began to implement its desegregation plan. The general objective of the program is to offer problem-solving skills to teachers and other school district staff and to familiarize the community with the district's desegregation goals.

The program is coordinated by a small staff within the Special Programs and Evaluation Division of the Board of Education. Since the program began, a series of four district-wide inservice meetings have been held. During the last school year, the emphasis of the desegregation-related inservice has changed. Presently, the focus is on specific building needs such as school discipline problems, cultural awareness, and communications with parents.

The staff development program for desegregation is not well coordinated with the other two programs. Those directing the programs have offices in different buildings and rarely discuss their courses

*The district pays instructors $200 for a 15-hour program and $400 for a 30-hour program.

and workshops with each other. Within programs, however, coordination appears quite good. No overlap seems to exist among those workshops or courses offered at the district level, and the district's central office oversees building-based workshops by sending guidelines to the schools on the kinds of workshops they might offer.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT FOR DESEGREGATION

The district's staff development program for desegregation began with four district-wide sessions. Each was designed by the U.S. Department of Justice's Community Relations Service (CRS) and was conducted by CRS or the human relations teams in the elementary schools. The first workshop was held in February 1978 on a Saturday. The goals of the workshop, according to the CRS and the central office, were to "sensitize all . . . involved in the elementary schools . . . to the broad issues of integration and to the goals of the [subsequent] workshops." Approximately 1,000 administrators, teachers, support services staff, parents, and other members of the community attended the one day lecture and discussion. The lecture, presented by a CRS staff member, touched on the general concerns about desegregation which face those approaching the process for the first time. A panel of school and community persons discussed their experiences in recently desegregated school districts and fielded questions from workshop participants.

After the first workshop, each of the nineteen elementary schools participating in the desegregation plan established a human relations team. The number of people on the team could, and did, vary; some had as many as fourteen people, others as few as six. Each team consisted of at least one administrator, one teacher, the ESAA teacher,* a parent, a community aide, and a teacher aide or paraprofessional. The second workshop in the CRS series, held one month later and also on a Saturday, was designed to train these human relations teams. Twenty staff members from CRS conducted "mini-workshops" with each school team and with

*Each elementary school in the plan had on its staff a teacher who specialized in human relations. The teacher's salary was paid through the district's ESAA grant. The teacher's primary role was to teach human relations to students.

a group of parents who were interested in the human relations workshops but were not part of a school group.

The CRS developed a human relations leadership manual to use during the workshop. The manual consisted of short, usually one-paragraph "case studies," or examples, of teacher or student behavior. After reading a case, human relations teams were asked to react and to discuss activities and resources which could be used in dealing with the problem situation.

The leadership manual also contained problem-solving and values clarification exercises, worksheets to help school teams develop human relations plans for their buildings, and lists of resource materials that suggested workshops and informal activities that schools could undertake to improve human relations among their staffs and students. The CRS hoped those on the teams would become familiar with the available multi-cultural materials and be able to use the materials in subsequent workshops and in activities conducted at the building level.

The human relations teams became the leaders for the third workshop, scheduled one week later. Each human relations team met in its school with the members of its staff. Problems specific to the school and human relations plans that covered staff development, the school environment, curriculum, and community participation were discussed. Although school plans were not completed by the end of the session, the schools had begun to identify needs and to set a general agenda for staff development for the following school year.

The last of the CRS workshops was held two weeks later. Participants met in their own schools and watched a three-hour panel presentation that was broadcast over the educational television channel. Specific information on testing and achievement, curriculum, and the use of multi-cultural materials was given. Following the broadcast, human relations teams and building staffs resumed discussions of their school plans.

The four CRS workshops were completed by the end of the spring semester. Since no school had finished its school plan, the district scheduled a five-day staff development workshop for the summer.

Each school was responsible for planning its own workshop, but the district issued general guidelines. Each school was expected to discuss the school's instructional program, integration strategies within the school, human relations among staff members, and ways to encourage parent participation. By the end of the week-long workshop, each school was expected to submit its human relations and staff development plan to the Special Projects office.

The elementary schools' plans had three components: activities, products and goals. The activity component consisted of a schedule of events to increase parent participation in school affairs, to promote greater parent/teacher contact, and to improve communication and cooperation among the staff. Products included written disciplinary procedures, bus and lunchroom regulations, and multicultural materials to be used in the classroom. Goals and objectives were submitted for the school year along with suggested approaches for achieving them.

During the 1978-1979 school year, the elementary schools implemented their plans. Two staff development days--one in the fall and the other in the spring--were scheduled. Workshops varied according to the needs and problems of each school building. However, workshops on discipline, human relations, multicultural education, and parental involvement were offered at most schools in the district.

All workshops that have been funded through the district's ESAA grant have been voluntary, and except for the one workshop held during the summer, all have been scheduled on Saturdays. The workshops have been directed primarily to the district's teachers. However, administrators, support services staff, and parents have attended most workshops. All participants, including parents, received a stipend.

PLANNING THE STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Planning for the district's inservice programs does not follow a uniform pattern. Superintendent's conference days are scheduled by the central office. The administration suggests topics that might be discussed in building workshops, but asks each school to assess its specific needs and to plan workshops that will address them. In some schools, the workshops are planned by building inservice committees;

and in other schools the workshops are planned during regularly scheduled staff meetings. There is no district-wide plan for assessing needs.

The general inservice education program is planned at the district level. Five teachers, designated by the teachers association, and five administrators, designated by the director of elementary and secondary education, form an inservice education committee. The committee meets three times a year to review proposals for inservice courses. Proposals are submitted by district employees or professionals in the community who would like to offer an inservice course. All proposals must indicate the targeted population, include a brief course description, and specify the number of inservice credits a participant will receive. Instruments that the instructor will use to assess the impact of the course on the participants and an agenda for each meeting of the inservice course must also be submitted.

The inservice committee approves between ten and fifteen courses for each semester. The list of courses that have been approved by the committee are then recommended to the superintendent. No course that has been approved by the committee has ever been rejected by the superintendent.

Although the district experienced a few, isolated racial incidents, the problems during the first year of desegregation were ones of adjustment more than of racial tension. To facilitate the adjustment, the district began the planning of inservice programs directed towards its desegregation efforts. It was one year after the implementation of the desegregation plan before related inservice was actually programmed.

The identification of needs and the planning for the initial desegregation-related inservice workshops were concentrated primarily within the Special Programs and Evaluation Division of the central office. Those in charge of the division asked several outside organizations and consultants to submit proposals for staff development for desegregation in the district. Of the three proposals that were submitted, the district chose one written by the Justice Department's Community Relations Service.

The CRS suggested that the district hold four plenary workshops during which general problems resulting from desegregation would be discussed, school human relations teams would be established and trained, and school building plans for further desegregation-related inservice would be developed. This plan was discussed with the ESAA program coordinators in the central office and was approved. The CRS trained three human relations specialists in the central office to act as resource advisors for the workshops and for building-level human relations activites.

During the second year of the desegregation-related staff development program, the planning became less centralized. Planning the workshops was now the responsibility of each school's staff and its human relations team. All staff members were not actively involved in the planning process. Thus, staff meetings often provided the forum for the committee to present its plans to the school staff and to ask for comments and suggestions for change. Ideas for inservice workshops and human relations activities were often initiated at these staff meetings.

An evaluation of the district's workshops through the fall of 1978 was written by the Community Relations Service. In the evaluation, the CRS criticized the district's planning efforts. A written needs assessment instrument had not been used at the beginning of the program nor had a uniform assessment form been written for developing school plans. The CRS also indicated that written material that presented the goals of the workshops and described practical applications of general human relations skills should have been available to participants.

OUTCOMES OF THE STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR DESEGREGATION

The staff development workshops that have been run with the district's ESAA funds are considered successful by central office administrators and participants. Some workshops were deemed more effective than others. Yet the majority of respondents indicated that the staff development program for desegregation has been useful and has provided participants with needed problem-solving skills.

Several specific outcomes of the program can be identified. As a result of the CRS workshop, schools have begun a planning and team building process. Staffs have planned specific activities and have instituted policies that, according to respondents, have improved human relations and facilitated the integration process. In addition, the workshops were believed to have indirectly benefitted students. Many participants in the district-wide and building-based workshops thought that the greater cooperation among school staffs that occurred as a result of the human relations workshops had prevented tension among students.

Although evaluations of the program are favorable in general, respondents in the central office view the effectiveness of specific programs differently from some of the other participants. The central office, for example, believed that the first workshop, for which five people from successfully desegregated school districts around the country were brought to Banton to discuss their experiences, was useful. According to the central office, it gave participants an opportunity to hear the problems other districts had encountered while desegregating and to see what solutions the district had found. Some participants, however, believed the workshop was too simplistic. The Banton schools were not totally segregated, and the community was not as resistant to the idea of desegregation as some communities in other parts of the country. In summary, the participants believed those leading the first workshop were not well enough informed of the stage of desegregation of the Banton district, nor did they know the actual concerns and needs of the school staffs or the community.

As the focus of the workshops turned from abstracted or potential problems toward specific problems and needs of building staffs, the workshops were better received by the teachers. Most workshop participants did not believe the situation in the district to be a volatile one, but did believe there were specific needs in the schools that could be addressed through human relations training. There were discipline problems in some schools, and a discipline code needed to be developed. Parental involvement in school activities was virtually absent in some schools and needed to be encouraged and increased.

Curriculums and textbooks usually did not include multicultural education or multicultural materials, and this needed to be corrected. Although participants were not always willing to attribute these needs directly to desegregation, they were able to admit that the needs were present and should be addressed through some sort of staff development or inservice program.

Butler School District
Eastern Region

Morlie Graubard and Nicki King

INTRODUCTION

Butler is a newly created school district. It is the result of a court-ordered consolidation of several districts. The consolidation was required in order to desegregate the schools of the city of Roscoe, as a result of the reopening of a court case filed in 1956 in one of the component school districts. The new district came into being July 1, 1978. The city of Roscoe and one suburban district, Porter, were predominately minority, while the other school districts were predominately white. The primarily white school districts took the role of plaintiffs. The school districts were combined as the result of a District Court decision that a desegregation plan solely for Roscoe would not significantly affect the racial identifiability of the Roscoe or suburban schools.

The Butler School District serves approximately 65,000 students in 99 schools with about 7,000 employees. The school district is approximately 70 percent white, 28 percent black and 2 percent Hispanic. It encompasses 330 of Butler County's 435 square miles.

DESEGREGATION

In September 1978, the Butler desegregation plan was implemented. The desegregation has taken the form of a 9-3 plan, under which children from the predominately minority districts, Roscoe and Porter, will travel for 9 years and be assigned to a school in their residential area for 3 years. Children from the predominately white districts will travel for 3 years and be assigned to a school in their residential area for 9 years. Approximately 23,000 children will be transported out of their area each year. It is planned that students will attend school for the entire 13 years with the same group, and feeder patterns have been established to accomplish this. Kindergartens are excluded from the plan, and each school has been reorganized with

grades 1, 2, 3 in primary schools, 4, 5, 6 in intermediate schools, 7-8 in junior high schools, and 9-12 in most high schools. Some 9th grades are in separate buildings or included in the 7-8 grade buildings. Travel distances may be as much as 30 miles and can take as long as 50 minutes.

Staff Change Required by Reorganization/Desegregation

Roscoe, the only district which had significant numbers of minority staff members in both teaching and administrative positions, has dispersed its staff throughout the new district in order to comply with the court order requirement for staff desegregation. As a result, pre-existing Roscoe staff are generally working in desegregated settings. There are minority teachers in all of the schools and minority administrators in the central office and in each of the five area offices.

The court order required the new district to place special emphasis on human relations. Human relations advisors were recruited from the teaching staffs of all of the component districts. Out of over 350 applicants, approximately 100 were selected. These advisors operate in two-person teams, which for the most part are male/female and white/black in composition. Each high school has a full time team, two middle schools share a team, and three to four primary and intermediate schools share a team. The functions of these advisors is still somewhat unclear; but they are being utilized in a variety of ways in the schools, depending on the desires of the principals and the teaching staff. Approximately 50 Home-School Advisors (whose function is related to problems the student may be having outside the school) are located at the secondary schools. The human relations teams are administered by and report to the deputy superintendent for human relations, a new position which was created as the result of reorganization/desegregation. Home-school advisors report to the deputy superintendent for operations.

Each of the former superintendents, except one, is currently (Spring 1979) employed by the newly consolidated district. Former superintendents who received appointments at the deputy superintendent level and above tended to pull their former staff members into somewhat higher

positions than other administrators may have obtained. The old loyalties to former co-workers are still there, but most administrators avowed a commitment to working together and making desegregation succeed. This commitment might be expected if desegregation were the only change the district were undergoing; but in the face of reorganization, new jobs, and new working relationships as well, the study team found unsolicited remarks in support of desegregation and working together something of a surprise.

Teachers' Strike

Shortly after school opened in the fall, the teachers went on strike. The primary issue in the strike was cross-district salary inequity, since within the new district teachers were still making their old salaries. There were substantial pay differences among teacher groups, and the reorganization plan had made no previous arrangements for pay uniformity. The highest paid group of teachers happened to be from the Roscoe District, who had been on strike two years prior to reorganization. As a result, the Roscoe teachers did not go out on strike, although teachers from the other ten districts did strike.

Since Roscoe was the only district which had substantial numbers of minority teachers, the strike appeared to break along racial lines. Most white teachers supported the strike; most minority teachers did not. Since the teaching staff of the schools had been desegregated, all of the schools were impacted at a similar level. In fact, the distribution of Roscoe teachers throughout the district probably made it possible for the strike to last as long as it did (six weeks). If all of the non-striking teachers had been located in one area, large numbers of schools might have remained closed for the duration of the strike.

It is reported that the strike had a serious impact on staff cohesiveness. This may have been most visible among the human relations teams, which were very dependent upon staff from the Roscoe district because of the emphasis on maintaining integrated teams. As a result, one team member might cross a picket line to come to work, while the other team member might be on the picket line. It is reported

that some staff reassignments were necessary as a result of tensions created at the time. It is also reported that many principals made conscious attempts to calm staff anxieties and to keep up a total "team spirit," recognizing that once the strike was over, the staff would have to work together.

OVERVIEW OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

For the past 3 years Butler School District has been involved in an extensive staff development program designed to prepare the component school districts for the eventual implementation of the desegregation plan under court consideration. The entire focus of the effort was on issues that would emerge as a result of implementing the plan: multicultural differences; administrative changes (due to the consolidation of the component school districts); curriculum consolidation; and community reaction.

As early as 1976 some of the component school districts undertook district-specific staff development activities geared toward informing their particular community of the issues involved in the litigation (which has been actively pursued since 1971). In 1977 the court ordered a 5-member planning board to be established. The members, appointed by the State Board of Education, were superintendents from 5 of the component school districts that eventually were required to consolidate. The planning board established several sub-committees to deal with various aspects of reorganization/desegregation. Some of these issues were specifically identified by the court (e.g., in-service training, curriculum, and human relations). Consequently, one of these subcommittees was charged with the responsibility for outlining staff development activities for the component school districts to prepare them for implementation of the plan. The staff development subcommittee was made up of 5 members, all from central office positions in districts representing the 4 geographical areas to be consolidated. Although their main orientation was to curriculum and the staff development activities necessary to implement the new curriculum, various human relations activities were developed and presented under their auspices.

Throughout the entire pre-implementation phase (approximately 1976-1977 school year to the start of the 1978-1979 school year) the staff development activities addressed the needs occasioned by two distinct issues brought out by the pending court decision: reorganization (i.e., consolidation of the component school districts) and human relations (brought on by the expected multi-racial mixing of students, staffs, and community members). We found that activities relating to developing and subsequently implementing a new curriculum model focused on eliminating racial bias in all instructional materials as well as eliminating racial bias in presentation of classroom information. By the same token, the most substantial human relations activities specifically trained former teachers and school administrators to be human relations specialists.

The staff development activities were basically financed by federal funds. The bulk of the money either came from ESAA (money provided directly to the district(s)), Title IV (consultant services and money provided for staff release provided by the DAC) or Title I (compensatory money provided directly to the district(s)). Prior to consolidation, ESAA and Title I funds went directly to the specific district(s) that had received the grant while it appears that the Title IV services were provided to participants from all the component school districts.

The target population varied from activity to activity but the intent was to involve all effected groups in the community: students, parents, certificated staff, classified staff, and administrative staff. However, it appears as if the bulk of the training activities were directed towards the teaching and administrative staff of the proposed district.

EXAMPLES OF SPECIFIC INSERVICE PROGRAMS

Four distinguishable staff development activities will be presented below. They were chosen because they reflect the various types of activities that have taken place over the past 3 school years. These activities were funded by federal monies. Some of the dollars went directly to the district while some took the form of in-kind

services. The activities were administered by the federally funded agency which provided the money.

The State University

The state university received several Title IV training institute grants to provide desegregation-related assistance to districts in the state. In 1976 they provided training assistance to 75 elementary teachers from the 3 Butler County districts selected to participate in a 4-week (5 hrs/day) workshop. The workshop focused on three areas: elimination of sex and racial stereotypes in curriculum materials, community relations, and human relations training. Through a series of lectures and small group interactions the participants were trained in the use of new curriculum materials and new interpersonal skills. Upon completion of the workshop this group of 75 were to act as a cadre of trainers to inform their building colleagues of new strategies for dealing with multicultural issues. During the school year the participants were able to maintain contact with their university trainers through a series of bimonthly meetings designed to air problems that had surfaced at the building level and present strategies and support for dealing with those problems.

In 1977, the university applied for and received another Title IV grant. This time they targeted 134 secondary teachers from the entire county. This program used the same format and presented the same type of material as the previous workshop. In this workshop they were able to utilize as co-trainers or facilitators some of the participants from the previous workshop.

In 1978 the university again provided Title IV funded training to the county. The focus of this program, however, was quite different. The court mandated the use of specially trained human relations specialists to provide a comprehensive human relations program, including a monitoring procedure, for the new district. The participants, selectively chosen by the new district, were all former teachers, counselors, and building administrators who volunteered to be considered for the new position. The State Department of Public Instruction devised new certification requirements for this position which required

15 units of human relations training. The summer workshop presented by the university gave the participants 3-4 units towards their certification. The trainers presented information on values clarification, conflict resolution, group interaction and skills for facilitating interaction between groups.

Desegregation Assistance Center (DAC)

The DAC in a neighboring state has been a constant presence during the pre-implementation phase of the desegregation plan in Butler County. The center took an extremely liberal approach to assisting and provided both training sessions run by DAC staff and money to the district to put on their own training activities. Examples of each follow.

For several years (1976-1978) the DAC ran "leadership training" programs for various types of county people. For the most part they seemed to focus on administrative personnel but teachers, parents, and community groups were often invited. Sometimes the center ran its programs in the evening, sometimes during the school day (and, if necessary, provided released time), and sometimes on Saturdays. The objective was to have representatives from each school and department present who would then serve as liaison to train their building colleagues. Typically, the center engaged outside speakers who had participated in desegregation in some part of the country to speak to the entire group. After the presentation to the large group, small group sessions were held where the participants were presented with a problem and asked to role-play various strategies to deal with the issue presented.

As stated earlier, the DAC also provided money to Butler County enabling them to undertake their own training activities. One of the most substantial of these activities, both in terms of material presented and number of participants involved, was a Saturday session held in February 1978. Nearly 250 teachers and administrators throughout the country participated in the workshop which was designed and presented by the planning board sub-committee on curriculum. In this instance, the DAC only served as a funding source, providing the district with money for teacher stipends.

This workshop was designed to present the new curriculum model that had been developed in response to the needs occasioned by the forthcoming desegregation. Because the model was concerned with eliminating racial stereotypes, the presentation was placed in the context of human relations. Consequently, the opening sessions focused on the desegregation experiences of various speakers from outside the county. A series of large group lectures were utilized to present basic concepts to the participants. Following the main presentations small groups discussed the main themes presented to the entire group. The idea was to familiarize the participants with some of the key human relations issues they and their colleagues might face, inform them of the impending curriculum changes, and train them to act as trainers of these human relations skills and curriculum issues at their buildings. Apparently, the participants had two critical assignments: to prepare their teaching colleagues to present one week of human relations issues to their classes during Spring 1978, and to inform their colleagues of the proposed new curriculum model. In conversations with various participants, we found that most went back to their schools and presented the material to their colleagues.

The sample of staff development activities presented up to this point were primarily oriented towards teachers. The staff development sub-committee did, however, realize the critical importance of training for administrators, particularly principals, and targeted some activities exclusively to administrators. Of particular interest was the 3-day workshop held in June 1978 for all school principals in the proposed new district.

The 3-day workshop was conducted by an outside consultant recommended and reimbursed by the DAC. The consultant utilized a series of large group discussions and small group interactions to present information on communication strategies and skills, methods for increasing community involvement, leadership skills, cultural differences, self-actualization exercises, and discipline techniques for desegregated settings.

The workshop was designed to facilitate information sharing as well as personal contact among principals. In order to achieve the

latter goal, principals roomed with their colleagues (when possible, interracial rooming was promoted) and spent a great deal of "non-classroom" time together.

ESAA

Another example of Butler's staff development program is a 4-day session run at each school site in the new district 4 days prior to the Fall 1978 semester. The other examples discussed above were at least partially funded by an outside entity that received federal money. The example presented below differs from those previously discussed in that it was entirely funded by federal money that went directly to the district from an ESAA grant.

Once again the staff development subcommittee was instrumental in planning the activity. However, their role was mainly administrative and advisory. They required all schools and staffs to participate, and prepared certain informational handouts. However, the content, focus, and format was left to each building principal. Consequently there was a great deal of variation in the type of program presented. For example, one principal set up the agenda, presented the material and then directed the small group sessions by himself. The focus of his sessions was on human relations. Another principal brought together a group of teachers to help plan the sessions. This group developed a student handbook, ordered the new materials, created attendance policies, and specified bus procedures. The 4-day session was then utilized to present these new school policies to the teachers. A third principal focused most of his attention on planning and preparation of a pre-school open house which introduced the new parents to the school and got the community involved in a more expanded role with the school. He and his teachers spent much of the 4-day preparation time visiting homes in the community.

PLANNING STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

The planning process for each of the activities previously discussed will be presented below. In general, the planning process for all these activities was highly centralized. The planning board

sub-committee on staff development took the lead in determining the desegregation-related needs of the districts. It should be kept in mind, however, that their role was somewhat circumscribed. As an agent of the planning board, which was established by the judge to facilitate the consolidation procedure, the sub-committee could only direct those inter/intra district activities that related to the eventual reorganization. Throughout the pre-implementation phase, the component school districts maintained a great deal of autonomy and were able to undertake their own staff development activities. Many of the districts chose to undertake desegregation-related training during this period, while many other districts did not. Consequently, staff development activities were either viewed as central office activities and centrally planned, or individual site activities and locally planned. It seemed, however, that the staff development sub-committee served as the main contact point for the staff development activities that took place during the 2 years prior to implementation of the plan.

The state university staff took the lead in planning the first two workshops which they conducted for Butler County teachers. They devised the focus and orientation and then checked with the district to see whether their priority needs would be addressed in the type of program the university proposed. According to Title IV regulations, the districts submitted a needs assessment document as well as a letter of intent to be included in the university's proposal.

In 1978, when the university trained the court-mandated human relations specialists, the planning process was somewhat different. Because they were responding to a specific court identified concern, the State Department of Public Instruction, the planning board sub-committee on human relations, the DAC and the university all worked together to plan the appropriate training session. As far as we were able to determine, there was no teacher participation in planning the summer workshop. However, during the followup phase of each of these workshops, the participants directed the university by raising whatever concerns had surfaced at the building level.

The Title IV regulations require the DAC to submit letters of

intent and various needs assessment documents along with its proposal for funding. Once funding was secure it appears as if the DAC presented plans for various workshops/sessions to the district and asked for comments. The formal planning process and in particular the role of the target group(s) in planning the actual delivery of materials is generally unclear. However, there is some detailed information concerning 2 programs funded by the DAC.

The planning board sub-committee on curriculum and staff development took the lead in planning the Saturday curriculum workshop. During the development phase of the curriculum model they received input from a large committee of teachers, curriculum supervisors, and administrators who served on the various committees developing the model. There were between 70 and 90 people involved in this process. However, once the model was developed, the 5-member sub-committee took charge of developing the type of training that they felt was necessary in order to properly implement the model. They chose this approach because, we were told, they felt it more important to target system needs than individual needs at that stage in the pre-implementation process.

In the case of the 1978 administartors' workshop, the staff development sub-committee worked with the DAC to suggest needs to the consultant who provided the training. He took an extremely active role in planning the activities to the extent of suggesting issues to the sub-committee, rather than passively responding to their needs. As far as we were able to determine, the participants were not involved in planning the activities.

IMPACT/OUTCOME OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

In general, Butler School District has begun its desegregation-related inservice with a heavy emphasis on school-level orientation and instructional re-direction. As a result, it seems that the school building level issues are not as critical as might have been expected for such a massive plan, and a crippling teachers' strike. Staff members are reported to understand the desegregation effort and seem to have a remarkable espirit de corps. It is reported that school level personnel need to have more training which is focused on the

specifics of school discipline and coping with wide achievement variations, and that they need more work with the new district-wide instructional model and curriculum objectives. Our field work confirmed this view, since none of the teachers with whom we spoke were currently using the instructional model.

The staff development for administrators did not appear to have prepared them nearly as well for consolidation as was the case with teachers. Perhaps this is to be expected; the task of teaching is the same activity for teachers this year as it has been in the past. New demands have been added and the working environments have changed, but the job itself is essentially the same. This is not generally the case for district administrators. Although some attempts were made to keep individuals in the same general areas of operations as prior to consolidation, this was not always possible and most administrators are currently in a new job relating to people who are strangers and whose administrative practices may or may not coincide with their own. Administrative procedures have not yet been established in many cases, and there appeared to be some contradiction about exactly who was responsible for exactly what. This confusion seemed to result in a tense climate in the central office, and even more ambiguity in the schools. Some principals said that this ambiguity resulted in delays for the most routine requests, and one claimed that the overall appearance it transmitted to staff members was non-supportive. Clearly more practice in working as a unit will help to clarify administrative channels, but it appears that some intensive staff development activity with administrators would be helpful.

On balance, it appeared that Butler's staff development program was adequate for the first year of desegregation. Different challenges to the system will come in the next years, as the school district and its component schools move from desegregation, the physical reassignment of various racial groups for schooling, to integration, the successful education of children from various cultures in a desegregated environment. The fact that Butler's staff development program has not yet begun this task was evident from our discussions with teachers and central office personnel.

One way in which this became obvious to the research team was in the overwhelming need articulated by teachers for staff training programs in school discipline. When respondents were questioned further about this perceived need, both black and white teachers responded that they were unsure of what disciplinary standards were appropriate for the "new" children. Black teachers, for example, felt they knew how to make black children behave, but expressed some doubts about whether those approaches were appropriate for white children. White teachers (who had not typically taught heavily desegregated classes before) felt that the disciplinary behaviors they had used for years with white children were not appropriate for the black children in their classes. It is important to note that all of these concerns came from elementary teachers, because the study team did not visit any high schools. The one school in which discipline was not mentioned as a problem had a principal who had spent a great deal of his inservice time training teachers on what he saw as a positive approach to student behavior. During the first week of school, the teachers at this school spent a fair amount of time developing consensus about the behavior-related rules of the school and getting the children to "buy in" to those rules. The teachers at the school thought the principal's approach was very valuable, and they preferred his staff development approaches to that of other programs they had attended. It might be valuable for the district to provide principals with tools and methods of replicating this principal's approach to staff development for "discipline" at the building level.

Most of the teachers with whom we spoke did not articulate an interest in participating in the planning of staff development activities. Instead, they seemed to want the programs to be building-based, so that the training itself would be more germane to their day-to-day problems. Most of them believed that they had few difficulties in teaching in a desegregated classroom, but they did think they needed more support and training in the new instructional model and in developing some viable alternatives to achievement grouping. Most of them seemed willing to change, but they saw themselves as bearing the brunt of too many changes in a short space of time. Many of these teachers

had changed schools (or principals), were teaching different types of students, had a new curriculum instituted, and, in many cases, had participated in a long strike to obtain salary parity. Surprisingly, teacher morale did not appear to be particularly low and most of the teachers with whom we spoke were willing to continue to try.

The human relations training program for the special teams seemed to have its greatest impact during the year long component rather than during the summer workshop. This may have been because the school-year segment was specifically oriented to problems the team members were encountering in their assignments, while the summer workshop was more theoretical in its approach. The school-year component may have acted as a reinforcement for the summer program. The success of this program, compared with the relatively low impact of the inservice program to introduce the instructional model, suggests that all inservice programs which aim for long-range changes should have a followup component which is focused on individual problems the staff member may be having in adapting the training to his or her particular classroom style. These followups should be in groups small enough to encourage discussion, and frequent enough so that the group develops a sense of itself as a team. This last suggestion was presented by one of the human relations group members who said the most important thing about their sessions and the level of interchange they developed was a sense that they were all "in this together." This, she added, helped her to look at the problems of other team members as problems she faced potentially herself, and to try harder to work on group solutions.

SUMMARY

Butler School District has begun its staff development for desegregation by introducing staff members to some of the changes desegregation and consolidation have brought. The introductory programs were mandatory, and consequently well attended, so most staff members appeared to have some awareness of those changes. Most staff members, from central office staff to the schools, are not yet sure of how to adapt to those changes, or what all of them mean for the way they do their jobs. Additional work in staff development is critical at all

levels. This work should be done intensively, in small groups, rather than generally, in large workshops; and its overall focus should be to help staff members adapt themselves to the long-range changes required by desegregating a newly created school district. For central office administrators, these changes include learning the bounds and limits of their jobs and the responsibilities of each administrative division. For area administrators, the changes include developing an improved understanding of their role vis-a-vis the central administration and the schools, and how to get things done in a new organization without relying solely on previous district allegiances. For principals, counselors and teachers, the changes include working together to develop goals and approaches for adapting the new curriculum to their own teaching styles, developing positive approaches for managing student behavior, and defining the role of the human relations teams. For the human relations teams, the changes involve adapting their style to serve a variety of clients who will necessarily define their role in different ways. Butler has begun a monumental task very well.

Fenton School District
Eastern Region

Evelyn Davila

INTRODUCTION

A small Northeastern "commuter town," Fenton covers an area slightly over six square miles with a population of 44,043. Over the past decade, population growth in Fenton has been minimal. A comparison of the 1930 and 1970 census reveals a population increase from 43,017 to 44,043. Blacks comprise 27 percent of the population, reflecting a ten percent increase over this forty-year period.

The town of Fenton is in close proximity to two large metropolitan areas permitting daily commuter travel between Fenton and these two cities. The median family income is high when compared to surrounding municipalities. A large percentage of families have incomes of $15,000 and over. The percentage of black families earning more than $10,000 is substantially below the percentage for white families in this area. Of the approximately nine percent of the total population defined as below poverty level, roughly half are black.

Fenton's public school system is organized on a 4-4-4 grade plan. There are seven elementary schools (K-4), two middle schools (5-8) and one high school (9-12). The district employs 398 teachers for a student enrollment of 6,300.

Following the national trend, the public school system has experienced an enrollment loss of both minority and non-minority students over the past years. Yet, the percentage of minority students has shown an increase to its present total of 45 percent (44 percent black, one percent other minorities).

DESEGREGATION PLAN

Attempts to desegregate the school system started during the 1960s. In 1961 a small, racially isolated junior high school opened with approximately 175 students. This small number of students posed program and staff limitations which caused the School Board to determine that it should be closed as a junior high school facility in 1962 but opened as a K-6 elementary school.

This closing of the school led to a suit against the School Board by five students who claimed that the decision to close the school deprived them of equal protection under the law as guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution. The commissioner of education stated that the petitioners had failed to show that their rights or educational opportunities had been adversely affected by the action of the Board and that such action "taken within the discretionary authority of the School Board was not discriminatory." The commissioner also stated that the Board's decision to reassign the pupils of the closed junior high by a lottery while the pupils of the other three junior high schools continued to be assigned on the basis of their residence, was an action that lay within the Board's discretionary authority and "was not illegal, arbitrary, unreasonable, or discriminatory." The commissioner, however, required the school district to present a plan which would end racial isolation.

At the same time the Board appointed a committee to study and propose a solution to the school district organization. Various plans were proposed and defeated until an interim plan was submitted in 1971 and approved by the commissioner of education. This plan gave the district the opportunity to work on a long-range solution to its school organization problems. It provided for neighborhood schools for grades K-4, fifth grade programs in two different schools, and 6-8 grade programs in two schools.

A plan of action was presented to the Board in 1972 by a newly appointed superintendent and was unanimously accepted. This plan provided for all nine elementary schools to be divided into clusters of three schools each for grades K-4, three middle schools for grades 5-8, and one high school utilizing three adjacent buildings for grades 9-12.

Each of the K-4 elementary schools was missing one grade. When the children in the school reached this missing grade, they were assigned to another elementary building which contained that grade level. Every elementary child was thus bused with students from his or her class for one year to another school and the following year was returned to his or her neighborhood school. Middle school students, as intact neighborhood groups, were transported to various sections of town.

In September of 1975, parents of children in K-4 were permitted to choose their child's elementary school. Basic pupil assignment patterns would remain the same; but parents would be free to choose any other elementary school in the district with the following restrictions:

1. parents could not choose a school in which the child's grade was missing;
2. choices could not create or aggravate racial imbalance in either the assigned school or the school of choice;*
3. choices could not create or aggravate overcrowding in any school.

In January 1976, the commissioner requested the school system to develop another plan which would provide for a better integration level in all of its elementary schools; the original plan of action was no longer considered acceptable.

The new plan was developed and accepted by the commissioner of education in September 1977. This plan provided for the redrawing of neighborhood elementary district lines, the pairing of two elementary schools, the creation of magnet schools and the relocation of special programs in all of the elementary schools in the district. Through these mechanisms, the district expected to provide natural integration in neighborhood schools without forced busing.

At present, according to the central office administration, all schools are integrated. At the elementary level, the minority student population in each building is between 30 and 40 percent; at the middle school, 48 percent; and at the high school, 43 percent. Under the new desegregation plan, 2,500 students were voluntarily riding buses as compared to the 1,800 students the district bused under its previous desegregation plan. The teaching staff is approximately 26 percent minority, and the central office staff is approximately 40 percent minority.

---

*A school would be considered racially balanced if it was not less than 25 percent nor more than 45 percent black in grades 2-4 taken as a whole.

OVERVIEW OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Prior to 1972, staff development efforts in this district were related to the needs of a particular school and did not deal with the district as a whole. In 1972, a staff leadership team, composed of 40 teachers and administrators began the first systemwide program of staff development. The program's orientation was to help teachers, students, and parents deal with the problems expected as a result of the integration plan. With funding provided by an ESAA grant, a week-long series of workshops was organized. These workshops were open to teachers, principals, administrators, and district residents. The general goal of the workshops was to present an overview of "teaching methods consonant with a pluralistic society."

In the summer of 1973, another week-long workshop was offered. The workshop was a continuation of the themes initially discussed at the previous year's programs.

In the fall of that same year, the School Board agreed to give equivalency credits for salary advancement to teachers who participated in inservice courses. A total of 40 courses was offered that year by the district. Classes met for two hours per week for 27 weeks. For each course completed, two equivalency credits were granted. More than 65 percent of the staff participated. The following are a few examples of the topics selected that first year: affirmative action for teachers, sexism in the curriculum, conflict resolution, values clarification, the gifted child, alternate modes of education, and math improvement.

In the 1974-75 school year, a Title IV grant was received and used to increase the number of inservice courses to 50. In general, it appears that teacher response to these courses was favorable, but once the teachers began to accumulate the maximum number of credits allowed, participation dropped noticeably.

During the 1975-76 school year only 18 courses were offered in two nine-week semesters, giving participants one hour of credit for every nine hours of participation. Approximately 130 people (less than 1/3 of the teachers) participated in these courses. Since the majority of staff members did not need the credits to advance on the salary scale, there was not an adequate incentive for participation, and interest in

the courses waned. Course content centered around desegregation-related themes.

During this same year, four half-days were allocated by the Board for staff development. Due to the fact that released time was given for participation in workshops, attendance was higher and more consistent than for the elective courses. Staff members were required to select from a list of topics for participation in one or two workshops. Seven topics were offered: the role of minorities in American history, eye witness to American history, self-concept development, sexism in education, counseling techniques, conflict resolution-crisis intervention, and multiethnic education.

During the summer preceding the implementation of the 1977 desegregation plan, an intensive one-week summer training program was offered to the staff participating in the newly formed magnet programs. The goal of that summer program was to insure that the total staff affected by the new desegregation plan and the magnet programs would be prepared. The rest of that school year, staff development was concentrated in individual buildings rather than on district-wide issues and needs.

This year (1978-79), the district's staff development program has been limited to two days set aside by the School Board as staff development days. There has been a decline in federal and district monies available to the district for staff development, an inadequate incentive system, and a yearly transfer of the district's staff development coordinator. The course credit incentive system made it possible for staff members to advance on the salary schedule rather rapidly, but this incentive had a limit once the maximum salary was reached. Perhaps indirectly affecting teachers' interest in staff development is the annual transfer of principals and other central office administrators. Each new person introducing his own personal priorities and style has led to an inconsistent and uncoordinated view of the objectives of the programs. The transfer policy is supported by the superintendent but by very few others in the district.

One of the two days set aside this year for staff development was in the final stages of preparation while we were visiting the district. The theme selected was "Strategies in Humanistic Education" with all

activities designed to reflect this theme. A total of five specially selected speakers from outside the district was to address the participants. In addition to these speakers, a series of workshops was to be offered during the day on a variety of topics. Each staff member was to choose one workshop to attend. A list of topics was distributed to each building for the staff to indicate their preference. Administrators' sessions were to be held separately. Some of the workshop topics follow:

Strategies and Techniques to Deal with the Tuned Out-Turned Off Student

Motivating Students Through the Use of Films

Hands-on Approach to Language Development for the Primary Child

Achievement, Motivation, Self-Concept

Self-Awareness: A Means of Self-Rapport

Affective Education: Strategies for a Positive and Qualitative Educational Experience

As evidenced by the topics being offered during the district's staff development day and by the opinions expressed by respondents, desegregation-related and non-desegregation-related themes are included in the overall inservice training programs organized by the district. There are no perceived differences between desegregation-related staff development programs and others offered.

PLANNING THE STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

A district staff leadership team was formed to develop the series of courses that were to be offered for equivalency credit. This team consisted of 40 teachers chosen by the superintendent and his associates based on their leadership abilities. These teachers were first provided training to identify major issues that needed to be dealt with under staff development.

The planning for this year's staff development day was done primarily by the desegregation specialist, who also has the role of coordinating inservice training programs for the district. Though she requests and gets suggestions from staff members on topics of interest, primary responsibility for the actual planning, selection of topics, and implementation rests with her.

At the building level, there is a committee responsible for the planning and implementation of workshops offered at each school. Principals are usually part of this committee and are involved in topic selection and implementation. Questionnaires are used at the building level to determine the needs of the teaching staff. Building inservice programs are offered at staff meetings which can be held twice a month as stipulated in the teachers' contracts. Also stipulated in the contract is that $6 an hour must be paid to participants who attend inservice programs outside of the regular school day.

A few respondents viewed the building workshops as mandatory. One particular workshop, offered at the building level, was seen by various people interviewed as a waste of time. No one knew how the topic had been chosen, and the presentation created very little interest among the teachers. They assumed it had been offered because the speaker was available.

The district staff identifies staff development activities with the particular coordinator responsible for it. The coordinator is well-known and district employees feel they can communicate their interests and needs. This communication can either be formal, through written questionnaires, or informal, through casual conversations.

At the beginning of the district's desegregation movement and the implementation of its desegregation plan, the planning process involved in setting up the staff development program was a formal, integral part of the inservice training plan. After those initial efforts and as the district moved to a successful integration pattern, planning for inservice training at the district level diminished. Emphasis is now at the building level and planning is done according to each school's individual needs.

Needs are no longer determined at the district level, but rather at the building level. The superintendent stated his interest in returning staff development to broad-based, district-wide issues, but it was not evident that this was being done this year.

According to respondents, there is no general pressing need in the district that should be dealt with through inservice. Some respondents felt a need for more desegregation-related workshops. Topics dealing with racial stereotyping, the psychological needs of both black and

white students and teachers, and improvement of teachers' attitudes toward students were some examples suggested by teachers. Others felt the inservice program had "touched bases" with all possible desegregation-related topics and the need now was for training in the academic subjects. Training programs which develop teachers' skills in the areas of reading, language arts and mathematics are a top priority now, in their opinion. Teachers interviewed were primarily mature, experienced individuals, both black and white, with at least five years experience in the district. Varying views on needs and impact of the programs could not be classified along any common element.

IMPACT/OUTCOME OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Administrators, in general, viewed inservice as very effective. They tended to see positive changes in teachers as a result of having participated in the inservice programs. Changes in attitude, student-teacher relationships and lessening of anxiety among teachers were some of the effects mentioned. There were a few administrators who felt that the changes in staff attitudes and competences were a result of time rather than a direct result of inservice.

Teachers varied on how they viewed the effects and usefulness of inservice. Some respondents could not identify any changes in staff attitude or behavior as a result of inservice; they personally felt that it was all a waste of time. Others felt that the amount of time given for holding a workshop was too short to be effective. Little can be achieved during a one-day session, so very little benefit comes to participants. Still others saw inservice as an opportunity to socialize with other teachers, an opportunity to meet and discuss common problems and experiences. They saw improvement in teachers' relationships with one another as one of the positive effects.

One of the most repeated suggestions for making inservice training effective for teachers was that it be implemented as "hands-on" workshops rather than presentations. They prefer a small group format that permits the handling and solving of the real problems they have in the classroom. Preparation of materials for use in the classroom is a welcome aspect of a workshop. Speakers or trainers who lead the workshops can be either

from the district or outside the district, but they must be knowledgeable on district matters. Topics chosen should be relevant to the district's needs and interests, and should have teachers' input in their selection. A formal followup should be part of the program and workshops should be offered as a series over a period of time. One-shot sessions were unanimously seen as a waste of time.

Stipends were seen as an effective incentive by a few respondents, but most felt that workshops should be offered during the school day with released time as the incentive. Teachers pointed to the fact that by 3:00 p.m. they were too tired to be receptive and not in the best frame of mind to work on changing attitudes and behaviors.

One administrator suggested an incentive system wherein a program was developed in conjunction with a college or university for college credit to be given for inservice classes. The tuition could be paid for equally by the district and the participant. Classes could be held in the district, eliminating travel time for the teachers. There would be no credit limit as there was for the equivalency credits, and teachers could obtain the needed credits for an advanced academic degree. Teachers did not mention college credits as an attractive incentive; and, when questioned about the possibility, saw it as an effective incentive for a few, but not most.

Teachers continuously emphasized the importance of their active involvement in the total inservice training process from understanding the need for inservice, to the selection of the topic, to the implementation of the workshop. This would, in their view, attract more participants and increase the benefits and effects of the program to those who participated.

Lamont School District
Eastern Region

Marvinia Hunter

INTRODUCTION

The Lamont School District is located in a city in the northeastern part of the country. The city's population in 1970 was 163,000 which represented a decline of more than 10,000 in ten years. Over the same span of time this city's minority population nearly doubled.

The school district student population has paralleled the population patterns of the city. The overall student population showed a steady decline from 31,500 in 1969 to 27,000 in 1978, while the black student enrollment increased from 21% in 1969 to 28% in 1978. Hispanic student population showed a steady increase from 4% in 1969 to 17% in 1978. Therefore, by 1978 the district's minority population represented approximately 46% of the total enrollment.

Administrative and teaching staff distribution by race within the school district has remained disproportionately white in relationship to the student population. In January 1979, of the district's approximately 150 staff in administrative coordinator positions or above, only 12 were black and 1 was Hispanic. Of the 1800 teachers, 148 were black and 56 were Hispanic.

The district contains four high schools, six junior highs and 35 elementary schools. All four high schools are relatively near one another in the downtown area of the city. All are and have always been desegregated under a voluntary open enrollment policy, each having a specialized curriculum.

In 1972, 22 of the city's 36 elementary school facilities were determined to be structurally substandard. The closing of some of these substandard schools gave the district a headstart with school desegregation prior to the implementation of the desegregation plan.

The policymaking body for this school district is a seven-member School Board; six are elected-at-large and the seventh is the mayor.

The School Board has fiscal autonomy and the responsibility for hiring all district staff.

DESEGREGATION BACKGROUND

The history of desegregation in Lamont began in 1965 with the implementation of a state law requiring the School Board of each district to submit to the State's Commissioner sufficient student enrollment statistical data to enable the commissioner to determine if racial imbalance existed in any of the public schools. In addition, the law requires that the school district submit plans to correct any racial imbalance that exists. Lamont Public Schools were found to have a number of racially imbalanced schools, and on April 1, 1966, in accordance with the law, the district submitted to the State Commissioner a plan to promote racial balance. The plan to be implemented during the 1966-67 school year called for: (1) changes in six elementary school district boundary lines; (2) changes in three junior high school district boundary lines; (3) planned construction of a new elementary and an addition to a junior high; (4) open enrollment; and (5) voluntary transfer of black students to all white suburban schools.

In September 1967, a second plan was submitted which contained the following:

- Additional changes in elementary school district boundaries.
- Transfers of 210 students from the only predominantly black junior high.
- Addition of a ninth grade to one of the high schools.
- Phasing out of grades 5 and 6 at substantially black schools.
- Additional construction at two substantially white schools.
- Appointment of a Director of School/Community Relations.
- Proposed development of an experimental school.

The next school year, 1968-69, a third plan continued the provisions of the previous year's plans, but also provided for additional closing of predominantly black schools and the construction of additions to white schools. Consequently, until 1972, the major methods employed

to achieve an improvement in racial balance were the closing of sub-standard schools in predominantly black areas and the busing of black students to predominantly white schools; the construction of new schools and additions in predominantly white areas to house the increasing enrollment; and some voluntary transferring of black students.

Although the district made desegregation gains, the State Board of Education did not consider the district's progress sufficient. In 1972 the commissioner withheld funds to the city charging that racial imbalance continued to exist. The School Board sued the State Board of Education. Funds were restored; but the court ordered the district to implement a short-range desegregation plan commencing in September 1973, and to work towards a long-range plan.

The state's task force on racial imbalance held hearings on a six area plan for the desegregation of the schools which had been twice rejected by the School Board. In May 1974, the State Supreme Judicial Court ordered the plan implemented in September. The plan called for the grouping of the thirty-six elementary schools into six enlarged geographic areas. The boundaries of these areas were constructed so that each of them contained one of the previously predominantly black schools. The elementary schools, which had traditionally included students from kindergarten through grade six, were converted to upper elementary for grades five and six or lower elementary for grades one through four. Kindergarten children continued to attend the school nearest their home, regardless of whether it was upper or lower elementary.

Those students in grades 1-4 who had previously attended schools which were now upper elementary were reassigned to lower elementary schools based on racial balance guidelines in order to achieve integration. Most of the areas contained only one upper elementary school and this was generally the one which had previously had a predominantly black student population. In all, approximately 7,500 students were bused for desegregation.

A small but growing population of Hispanic children (mostly Puerto Rican) were all assigned to one of the six districts. Plans are now being made to desegregate Hispanic students.

Implementation of the plan proceeded smoothly. Factors contributing to the smoothness with which desegregation occurred were varied. One factor was the history of desegregation in the city which included some racial strife, but which tended to lessen the fear of new school attendance patterns. The series of small but significant steps throughout 1967, 1968 and 1969 (e.g., school consolidations, reassignment of black students, proposed construction and voluntary programs) prepared the community to accept the more extensive plan to follow. The exclusion of kindergarten children from the plan allowed younger children to remain in their own neighborhoods.

Perhaps the most important reason for the smooth implementation of the plan was the countless hours spent in the preparation of parents, students, and staff. Civic leaders, clergy and parents worked together to insure the safety of children. Dozens of implementation meetings took place all over the city. The training aspects of these meetings will be described later in this report.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Lamont School District has placed a moderate to heavy emphasis on inservice training. Desegregation-related training began as early as 1971 and has continued to the present. Programs are funded by the federal government, the state and the district. Target populations have primarily been teachers, although greater emphasis was placed on community and parent training the year of and just prior to desegregation. During these years the primary focus of the programs was on human relations and cultural awareness. Since the implementation of the desegregation plan, the trend has been to de-emphasize human relations and to stress basic skills, curriculum approaches and teaching techniques. General inservice programs are available to all certified staff; however, the programs are planned primarily for non-tenured teachers.

Desegregation Orientation Programs

In 1971, the Anti Defamation League of B'nai B'rith received a $40,000 contract from the district to conduct training. For approximately two years the League held meetings with schools, community and church groups

focusing attention on prejudice and stereotyping. In the year prior to the implementation of the desegregation plan, an extensive orientation program was undertaken to prepare the students, parents, and school district personnel for desegregation. Many respondents attributed the smooth implementation of the desegregation plan to this extensive orientation program. These programs were district funded.

The goals of these programs were as follows:

- o to disseminate information regarding the logistics of the desegregation plan
- o to familiarize parents of sending and receiving schools with the school's curriculum, materials and teaching methods
- o to allay staff, student, and community fears normally associated with desegregation
- o to sensitize staff to the needs of minority students

It appears as though over 100 meetings took place during the school year and the summer just prior to desegregation implementation; however, there were no records available to specifically indicate the exact number of meetings, locations, or participants. The meetings were conducted by principals, central office administrators, and subject matter supervisors.

It seems that the leadership of the community gave their total support to the program. The clergy, Chamber of Commerce, Urban League, B'nai B'rith, and dozens of other community groups joined in support of the meetings.

No specific format or training methods were employed other than open discussion and the dispensing of information. The types of meetings held and the general topics covered were as follows:

(a) Meetings with Parents at Sending Schools. Some of the topics were: bus information, school facilities, policies, parent participation, curriculum, materials, discipline, extra curricular activities, luncheon menus, special services, and safety.

(b) Meetings with Parents at Receiving Schools. The same general topics as those above were covered.

(c) The Development of a Parent-Teacher Organization (PTA). No PTAs existed in any of the new 5th and 6th grade schools. During the summer of 1974, the principals began an intensive effort to form PTAs comprised of feeder school parents and new staff. Notices were sent to new parents and followup calls were made. Although such activities might not normally be considered training, the formation of these groups was considered to be an integral part of the overall orientation program.

(d) Orientation for Total Staff at New 5-6 Grade Schools. The orientation program at the new 5th and 6th grade schools involved professional, civil service and paraprofessional personnel. Since the staff was new, general orientation concerning the facilities, duties, curriculum, routines and policies was conducted. Attention was also devoted to human interactions related to desegregation. Since each school planned and conducted its own orientation program, it was not possible to determine the exact amount of time spent in each activity.

In September 1974, just prior to the implementation of the desegregation plan, the School Board delayed the opening of school for eight days. It was during these eight days that most of these orientation programs were conducted. However, since each school planned and conducted its own program, it is not possible to determine exactly how much time was devoted to desegregation-related topics as opposed to the other topics.

DAC Inservice Training

A major portion of inservice training for the Lamont School District was conducted by the Desegregation Assistance Center of a nearby university. The training provided by the DAC appears to have been quite extensive taking the form of training institutes, one-day to two-week

workshops, planning and needs assessment meetings and community meetings. Training was conducted for administrators, teachers, para-professional staff, counselors and some parents.

The DAC staff training began in 1971-72 under a Title IV Institute Training Grant. The DAC continued to conduct training in the district over a three-year period. Sessions varied in length, but most were one to two week consecutive sessions. Sessions were held during the summer, after school and during the school day. Whenever sessions were on other than school time, stipends were paid to participants.

The DAC was one of the first outside-of-the-district groups to be invited to assist with the desegregation process; therefore, in order to gain the confidence of the district's leadership, the DAC first involved the administrators in a needs assessment process. While the DAC wanted to design training to meet district needs, it also viewed needs assessment as a training objective in and of itself.

Out of these meetings grew the overall goals of the district's training. The goals, in general, related to the district's desegregation goal of easing the isolation effects of desegregation. The DAC and district administrators believed effects would be the greatest in the areas of staff attitudes towards minorities and curriculum bias. Therefore, the program was designed to focus heavily on minority cultural awareness, evaluation of textbook stereotyping, institutional racism, human relations and group dynamics.

Training processes varied. Each session usually began with warm-up exercises. Simulation games and other trainer-initiated role playing exercises were used. At times trainers lectured on specific topics, following up with small group discussions. The DAC's overall approach was one of understanding and persuasiveness in a deliberate attempt <u>not</u> to evoke guilt feelings among the participants.

Funding for the program was a combination of Title IV and district funds. Trainers were paid by the DAC and participant stipends by the district. Trainers were selected by the DAC from universities and the school district. In all, approximately nine different trainers were used.

At the close of each session, participants were asked to complete evaluation forms. There is no evidence that evaluation results were analyzed or utilized in any formal way.

City-Wide Inservice Offerings

City-wide inservice courses/workshops are offered by the district to all teachers. Approximately 86 offerings were available this year. Preference for participation in these courses is given to non-tenured teachers, categorically funded teachers, and long-term substitutes because the teacher contract stipulates that non-tenured teachers must attend 10 city-wide inservice programs each year.

Offerings cover a wide range of topics such as art, audio visual, bilingual education, career education, educational research, environmental education, state categorical program proposal development, Title IX, health education, home economics, industrial arts, mathematics, reading, music and multicultural education. Each course is a one-hour, one-day session offered after school. Trainers are selected primarily from within the district. Some trainers are classroom teachers, others are supervisors of the various subject areas. On occasion, outside consultants are used.

State Inservice Programs

The overall objective of the state funded program is to improve the quality of education in those communities which have racially balanced their schools. Tremendous flexibility has been given the schools in determining how to best improve education. The $1.6 million SEA allocation to Lamont for the 1977-78 school year was spent on a variety of educational programs. Staff development allocations totaled $60,169 and provided inservice training for 617 staff members from elementary, junior high, and senior high schools.

Allocations to the district's schools are made on the basis of pupil enrollment. Planning and preparing proposals is left to each individual school. Most schools have opted to use the money for the hiring of paraprofessional staff and resource teachers. Only a few

of the schools chose to focus on staff training.

The focus of training programs included basic skills, social studies, home economics, vocational education, multicultural education, gifted and talented, Latin and environmental science. The tremendous range of programs attests to the flexibility of the guidelines. There seemed to be no overall district objectives into which school objectives were to tie. This left the focus of a program in the hands of an individual school. Those programs which appeared to have merit were approved by the central office.

Training format, trainers, length of training and materials varied greatly from program to program. In most instances, stipends were paid for teacher participation whenever training took place after school hours.

Evaluation of the state program is formally done by an in-district evaluator. The evaluation report appears to be quite comprehensive, except there is no mention of staff development activities.

Desegregation-Related vs. General Inservice Programs

In this district, the implementation of the desegregation plan gave rise to inservice programs specifically designed to facilitate the desegregation process. The focus of these programs were human relations, minority cultural awareness and orientation to the logistics of the plan. Much emphasis was placed on the notion that racial conflicts might arise as a result of mixing races. This type of training began approximately two years before the final desegregation plan went into effect, became more intense the summer prior to implementation, and continued (with decreasing emphasis) for approximately two years following implementation.

Following implementation of the desegregation plan, increasing emphasis was placed on inservice programs that meet the needs of a desegregated setting. Many of the personnel indicated that the district's minority students have, in general, poorer achievement, poorer attitudes towards school and lower motivation. Since desegregation has resulted in greater numbers of minorities attending schools which previously were considered more homogeneous, greater diversity in student

achievement in the basic skills now exists. As a consequence, the district believes the overwhelming inservice need is to train teachers to be more effective in dealing with this wider range of differences in the basic skills area.

This basic skills type of inservice training would be offered whether or not desegregation had ever taken place, but it would not have received as great an emphasis nor would as many teachers have been urged to attend. In prior years, this type of inservice was only stressed for those teachers that taught in racially impacted and Title I schools. The desegregation plan implementation and white flight have caused more schools to qualify for Title I and greater numbers of teachers to come in contact with minority students.

In summary one might say that the district views all of its present inservice as designed to meet the needs of a desegregated setting, according to its own definition of those needs. Since the overwhelming need is viewed as one of dealing effectively with the needs of lower achieving and less motivated minorities, desegregation-related training is defined largely in this dimension.

PLANNING STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

In general, the district's trend has been towards decentralization of inservice planning. During the school year prior to desegregation, planning for inservice programs was done primarily by the elementary principals, central office administrators and subject matter supervisors. In programs such as the state funded programs and district in-building inservice, planning is done at the building level and involves teachers and principals. There is, however, no evidence that parents or students are involved in the planning process. Building level planning generally occurs during faculty meetings.

When outside trainers were used for human relations and cultural awareness programs, the trainers were primarily responsible for planning. However, they usually chose to involve administrators and principals in the needs-assessment phase of the planning process.

A slightly more formal needs-identification process occurs for the city-wide inservice offerings. A survey form is sent to all

teachers requesting that they specify the areas in which they need training. The results of these forms are tabulated and courses built around these offerings.

In general, little overall district inservice planning or coordination takes place. There is no one person assigned to oversee programs nor are well defined guidelines in terms of goals, directions or objectives provided to individual schools. The unifying element of present inservice programs seems to be focused on basic skills.

Three needs were identified throughout the district:

1. A need for improvement in teaching the basic skills in an integrated setting (i.e., one in which a wide range of abilities exists).
2. A need for helping white middle-class teachers to understand minority students.
3. A need for effectively teaching the gifted and talented students.

IMPACT/OUTCOME OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

In general, the respondents described a medium to high impact of inservice programs on minority cultural awareness. Many participants believed teacher and parent attitudes had changed to ones more accepting of minorities. Most teachers indicated that they are "color blind" with respect to students. Some believed that behavioral changes had occurred in teachers as a result of understanding cultural differences, but some of the staff members' descriptions of these changes indicated that staff attitudes were not egalitarian or completely unbiased.

Several respondents felt that the district had not been effective in actually changing personal attitudes. They felt that the staff had made great strides in gaining competence and skill in teaching basic skills to children of wide ranges of ability.

Suggestions for program improvements vary. One respondent wanted to see more centralizing of programs. This respondent believed centralizing would bring about more coordination and quality control. Another suggested that a substitute pool be developed in order to

provide more released time for training. Another felt inservice should eliminate labels such as human relations and cultural awareness and should focus on issues and problems at the individual schools. If, for example, teachers were working on textbook selection, training should primarily focus on that activity, but could also involve helping teachers to recognize the need to look at racial and sex role stereotyping in textbook selection as part of the function of selecting texts.

Maxwell School District
Eastern Region
Nicki King, Morlie Graubard

INTRODUCTION

Maxwell is a small, suburban eastern community about 30 miles outside of a large metropolis. The community is largely middle-class and racially mixed (62 percent white, 27 percent black, 11 percent Hispanic), although the housing patterns appear to be segregated. The bulk of the adult population commutes to the large city daily, although an increasing percentage is finding work closer to home. The light industrial and commercial base in the area has greatly expanded in the last 10 to 12 years as many major corporations have exited from the city to Maxwell's "backyard."

The school district is quite small. There are six schools to serve an average daily attendance of 4,400. The district, like almost all other school districts, has been in a declining enrollment phase for several years and has closed some of its school buildings. Currently, the district is operating four elementary schools, one middle school, and one high school. The decline in enrollment has led to a reduction in the teaching staff, which has retarded any affirmative action progress and reduced the number of minority teachers district-wide to an extremely low level. (During 1978-79, there were about ten black teachers and one Hispanic.) Minority teachers are spread throughout the district, so that no school has more than one or two. The few black staff members have recently formed an advisory committee to study the role and treatment of black students within the district.

Four years ago the School Board hired a new superintendent. The superintendent, from a large urban school district which had recently desegregated, had also been superintendent in other desegregated districts and was reported to be committed to desegregation and quality education. The School Board was in the process of voluntary redistricting, which would result in desegregation, and wanted a superintendent who had been through the experience and could peacefully implement their

new policies. Although the district had voluntarily desegregated and there was no court order or civil suit, there were race-related riots in the high school and middle school which contributed to the urgency of the redistricting process.

Redistricting seemed to take place as much because of declining enrollment as because of racial tension. In 1973 the district closed an all-minority elementary school due to rising costs and declining enrollment. Consequently, the district reassigned students and staff from that school to two other elementary schools. Publicly, the major reason reassignment began in 1973 was not to achieve racial balance but rather to accommodate the district's student and staff population in a smaller number of schools. Racial balance was a consideration, but not the primary concern.

During the 1974-1975 school year, there were race riots at the high school and the middle school. In response to the riots, the School Board appointed six advisory subcommittees to study various issues relating to the policies then in effect so that future changes could be recommended. Each subcommittee had district staff, citizen, student, and parent representation, with 85 people appointed in total. The subcommittees formed a seventh committee known as the Redistricting Steering Committee to serve as liaison between the subcommittees, the school district, and the School Board. Their work took place during the 1975-76 school year.

The subcommittees were given a list of nine questions the School Board and superintendent felt were critical. They were not, however, restricted to the nine questions nor were they required to respond to all of them.

Their final report was submitted in May 1976 to the School Board. They chose to focus their attention at the elementary school level. Data were collected through a series of surveys targeted to 6th grade students, elementary teachers, parents, and elementary principals. The following issues were addressed:

- parent involvement in school activities/decision-making
- materials (audio-visual, multiethnic)
- student/teacher ratio

- o transportation
- o comparison of school racial balance to district racial balance
- o teacher attitudes toward the goal of racial balance, school administration, central office actions, and special services
- o parent attitudes toward redistricting and school programs
- o student attitudes toward students of different races and school programs
- o student achievement

The Board asked the steering committee, as the agent of the six subcommittees, to highlight its recommendations. The committee presented a synthesis of its findings and recommendations to a subsequent meeting of the Board. For the purposes of this study, several of their concerns and recommendations are important. The level of parental participation in schools was low and was felt to reflect a general lack of support for the redistricting policies of the district. The parents of children at the two elementary schools with the highest percentage of minority students indicated a higher level of dissatisfaction with school facilities than the parents of children at the predominantly white schools. There was a lack of multiethnic materials at all schools. The committee reported little evidence of inservice training to help teachers deal with minority students, and the committee felt the level of school staff support for the redistricting policies of the district was quite low.

The published reports concerning the district position on redistricting seem to indicate support for the Board's goal of establishing school racial parity within five percent of the racial groupings within the entire district. There was little evidence of supportive services in the district which would promote this goal.

OVERVIEW OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Each school in the district receives $2,000 annually to undertake staff development activities. The nature of these programs is left entirely to the discretion of the principal. There is a great deal of variation in programs between schools, although none of the programs

are regarded as specifically desegregation-oriented. Additionally, there were instances where the principal did not opt to use the funds set aside for staff development. This would seem to indicate that the principals might profit from staff development which would train them in the use and importance of various programs.

One of the elementary principals used her staff development resource money to put on a program called "the heart of teaching." This program was conducted during four weekly afternoon sessions. It was conducted primarily by the principal in an attempt to get to teachers' feelings and to build levels of staff trust. Staff members reported that the program was very helpful in getting them to examine why they were teaching and to begin to work together as a team.

Another example of inservice training at the elementary level is a program developed for one school's teaching staff in order to promote affective education. The school principal contacted a trainer from a nearby school district who offered a series of Saturday workshops focusing on communications skills and TET (teacher effectiveness training) strategies. The trainer utilized short lectures, practice sessions and large group discussions to familiarize the teachers with the appropriate skills and strategies. The teachers were required to attend the workshop and participate in a series of followup meetings designed to address problems they experienced when attempting to implement the strategies in the classroom. The trainer felt that the sessions heightened teacher awareness and he observed some implementation of the skills presented when he visited their classrooms.

Maxwell has a Title IV C dissemination grant operating at the high school. The program trains teachers in new curriculum ideas, discipline techniques and classroom management procedures. The goal is to reduce the rate of student dropout. Thirty-two of the high school faculty are involved on a volunteer basis, and the teachers receive inservice credit. One interesting aspect of this program is the use of peer critique. Teachers observe each others' classroom behavior and feed the information back to the teacher. The program has also identified teacher behavior that models the techniques of the program and uses some teachers as role models. Additionally, they have video-taped some classrooms. The program

is conducted by the school psychologist. His evaluations apparently show "statistically significant" results in the use of classroom management skills by teachers, the increase of parent cooperation with student personnel services, and an increase in student cognitive and affective outcomes.

Staff development at three of the elementary schools and the middle school has focused during this year on the development of a teacher learning center (TLC) which is operated by an outside consultant to the district. This is the most structured inservice activity reported in the district. The program focuses on teaching teachers about styles of learning and on enhancing their effectiveness in the classroom. It began with a one-week workshop during the summer and has continued with once-a-week meetings and five-hour workshops once a month. The training program includes discussion and demonstration teaching by the trainer in the teachers' classrooms. The investment of teacher time outside normal working hours is not reimbursed by the district, but participants receive inservice credits for salary advancement. The value of this as an incentive for participation is not clear, since it appears that the least experienced teachers have been with the district for about four years, and most teachers are close to the top of the teaching salary schedule. Taking this into account, it would appear that participants are finding the program valuable because all 21 of the teachers who started the program in September have remained in it. Neither the trainer nor the participants viewed the program as primarily related to desegregation, but they all believed it would enhance the success of desegregation if teachers could learn to recognize and respond to a more varied range of learning styles.

PLANNING STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Since virtually all of the staff development activity in the Maxwell district is directed from the school building level, it is difficult to make comprehensive statements about the planning of staff development activities. This planning, except for the TLC program, is completely dependent on the attitude and emphasis of individual principals toward staff development. In two of the schools, the

principals were new to the district and had severe staff morale problems. One of the principals responded by involving teachers in committees and community activities and increasing the emphasis on staff development. She took a strong leadership position and acted as an advocate for her staff with the district. Her strong position in favor of staff development activities resulted in a district-wide increase in the amount of released time made available for staff development.

The other new principal responded to the staff morale problems in his building by placing staff development as a low priority. He believed that most of the teachers in his building were senior and did not really need staff development. He thought that what they did need, in most cases, was time to interact with him on a one-on-one basis, quite often in the classroom. Interestingly enough, he did not regard this as "staff development," but as being a good principal and maintaining a good school climate.

These two views describe the polarity of principal attitudes in Maxwell relative to the importance of organized staff development. The only instance of central office involvement in staff development planning occurred in the Title I office. The Title I director planned inservice training workshops for Title I teachers and aides, but most of the actual training she delivered was for aides. In each workshop, the director was the sole planner and she was also the principal trainer. The Title I training was seen as desegregation-related primarily because the redistricting had dispersed the Title I children throughout the district and impacted all of the schools. Her decisions about what topics to cover in the training were based on classroom observations and a review of the staff backgrounds, with minimal input from those to be trained. In this respect, the Title I training seemed to be like training done by an outside district consultant.

The primary outside consultant was the professional trainer who came into the district to operate the teacher learning center. The TLC program was designed to meet individual teacher needs and school-based problems by focusing on learning styles and communications patterns. The consultant who ran the program saw TLC as an attempt at cooperative learning and stressed that he planned the training sessions

to be loose enough to meet individual participant needs. His view of the program was that it was "tailored" to each district, depending on the amount of time and money the district was willing to invest in it. In this sense, the program did not seem to have a defined end point or fixed goals. The objectives seemed to be behavioral and affective, although the beginning of the program had a traditional lecture-type format.

IMPACT/OUTCOMES OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Because the staff development programs have largely operated at the school building level, it is not possible to make generalizations about the district-wide impact of a particular program. The very diffused nature of the staff development program does serve, however, to reduce its visibility in the district, and in some instances to de-emphasize it as a priority. The school staff is completely dependent on the principal's attitudes about staff development for the institution of a coherent staff development program, or in fact for the institution of any program at all. The potential of this dependence for leading to no staff development is increased by the fact that principals are given no guidance or inservice training themselves to stimulate their desire to offer training for their staff members. Furthermore, there is no requirement that they utilize any of their training budget. As a result, though the superintendent expressed a strong district-wide commitment to staff development, this commitment has not been transmitted uniformly to the district's staff.

At the school building level, the TLC program seems to have had positive outcomes for the teachers who have participated; although some teachers expressed a desire for more practice time with the trainer. None of the teachers were able to be precise about the <u>way</u> in which they felt their teaching had improved, although all of them rated the program highly. Similarly, "the heart of teaching" and the affective education programs were felt to be very helpful in improving staff attitudes and relationships with students. None of these programs were related directly to the desegregation or redistricting activities, although some teachers believed that their minority students benefitted

more than their Anglo students from the effects of their participation. This belief seemed to be related to the view that the teacher's ability to understand and respond to students with different learning styles and different educational needs was enhanced in the programs. Several of the teachers also seemed to believe that anyone who improved their abilities as a teacher would by definition be a better teacher in a desegregated classroom.

Although the above is probably true, it appeared that the identified inservice needs of teachers, counselors and principals indicated that the programs in which they had participated were not sufficient to address all of the problems they had encountered in a desegregated environment. Some of these needs included an increased awareness and sensitivity of cultural backgrounds, alternatives to ability grouping, and developing a unified curriculum among the various schools in the district. Some of the intensity of awareness of these problems is probably due to the fact that many teachers do not yet feel certain of their abilities to teach poor and minority youngsters. Others may feel no need to change. As an example, all of the students seen by a remedial reading teacher in one of the elementary schools were black. When the teacher was asked about this, she replied that the regular classroom teachers were unwilling to spend the extra time on a minority child with reading difficulties, while they might feel more comfortable giving extra help to a majority child. Several staff members felt that some teachers were harder or more critical of a minority student while they would ignore the same behavior in a white student. Maxwell leadership has not sent a strong message to its school staff which might help them to take the next step in securing the skills needed to work effectively with minority students.

Mercer School District
Eastern Region

Meg Gwaltney

INTRODUCTION

Mercer School District is located in a large industrial and commercial center in the East. Just over 460,000 live in the city, of which nearly one-fourth are minority. The school system, not unlike other systems around the country, has changed substantially during the last few years. In 1972, the schools enrolled between 60,000 and 70,000 students, the majority of whom were white. The nearly 100 schools in the district were racially identifiable. Those closest to the center of the city and in the southern section were predominantly black; the others were predominantly white.

In 1978-79, the student enrollment totals 50,000, and blacks constitute the largest group with just over 48 percent. Other minority groups comprise about 5 percent of the district's population. Of the 90 schools in the Mercer system--58 elementary schools, 1 middle school, 14 high schools, and 17 special schools--most have a minority enrollment of at least 20 percent. Sixteen schools, however, have virtually no white students.

DESEGREGATION BACKGROUND

Since 1976, Mercer has been under a federal court order to desegregate its schools. As early as 1967, the district was making an effort to integrate black students into the predominantly white schools on Mercer's periphery. Through the central office department of school integration, the district instituted a voluntary transfer program for inner city students in grades kindergarten through eight. The program, called the integrated education program (IEP), allowed parents of inner city children to choose a school in one of Mercer's suburban areas.

Although the popularity of the IEP grew over the years, the program was not entirely successful in desegregating the district's schools. In 1972, the NAACP and the Citizens Commission on Human Relations (CCHR) sued the city and the state, claiming that the district was operating a

segregated system. Two years later, the case was tried in a federal court; and, two years after this (April 1976), the judge ruled in favor of the plaintiffs. The district was ordered to implement a desegregation program.

The federal judge has continued to play a major role in the district's desegregation efforts. As the district and the plaintiffs have continually argued over the direction of the plan and its implementation, the judge has tried to mediate the discussions. The judge is in contact with the district almost daily, guiding it in its desegregation activities.

The judge's effort to mediate the desegregation with the community has caused problems during the three years since the desegregation order. For example, when 680 teaching and administrative jobs were cut during the 1978-79 school year (resulting in what the School Board, the CCHR, and the NAACP agreed would be a weakening of the desegregation effort), the judge was asked to order the city to fund and restore some of the lost positions. The judge ordered the district to restore 254 of the jobs. When the mayor of the city argued that the additional funds required to finance these positions would result in massive layoffs in the city's police and fire departments, the judge delayed his order indefinitely. Such accommodation to political winds has angered those closely involved with both sides of the desegregation effort. The judge, feeling that he could not ignore the "serious financial plight of the city," ended up pleasing no one.

This example appears characteristic of the overall approach that has been taken in the city toward integration. The judge, who is in many ways more responsible for implementing the district's desegregation plan than those within the district's central administrative offices, has adopted a conservative approach. Not wanting to disrupt the community by mandating the busing of children, the judge has accepted a modest desegregation plan. Since 1976, the district has relied on a voluntary transfer program, the mainstay of which continues to be the ten magnet schools in the central city which attract both black and white children. Black children may also participate in a voluntary busing program, thus allowing black students to attend the formerly white schools in the city's outlying neighborhoods.

This plan has been attacked as weak, slow, and one-sided. As of Spring 1979, sixteen elementary schools, which enroll nearly half of the city's black elementary school students, remained at least 80 percent minority. In addition, the plaintiffs argue, the voluntary busing program for minority children is in itself discriminatory; no reciprocal program exists for whites. In response, the judge issued an order supporting the plaintiffs' claim that the district's plan was placing disproportionate burdens on the city's minority population. The district was mandated to develop an entirely new desegregation plan, one that would successfully desegregate the district's remaining minority schools while treating all within the system equitably.

OVERVIEW OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

The emphasis of the district's staff development program has changed in the last several years. Although some inservice for desegregation was offered by the Department of Integration before 1976, most inservice was in the form of college courses attended after the school day. Upon the accumulation of a certain number of credits, teachers became eligible for advancement on the salary schedule.

Currently, the staff development programs that the district offers are primarily to answer the needs resulting from desegregation. Staff development for desegregation is financed through ESAA, Title IV C of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), and district funds. The programs are directed toward teachers, administrators, students, and parents. The overall plan consists of five separate, but overlapping, components: 1) the human relations inservice program offered by the department of human relations; 2) the school improvement resource team (SIRT); 3) the pupil awareness guidance experience project (PAGE); 4) the career awareness through self-esteem project (CASE); and 5) the IEP human relations workshops. Responsibility for the five programs differs. Although the first four are, in principle, overseen by the coordinator of integration, the programs are actually autonomous. Communication among inservice trainers is poor. Thus, considerable overlap in purpose exists among these programs. In addition, the programs offered by IEP often compete with those conducted by the Department of Human Relations.

The Human Relations Program

The human relations program offers the widest range of services of the five. The program, funded by ESAA, employs four human relations inservice trainers, who provide services to administrators, teachers, parents, and students. The objectives of the program are as follows:

- to help develop a positive school climate that is conducive to learning;
- to help develop appropriate behavioral patterns among students and staff and, thus, to reduce incidents of disruptive behavior in class and the number of suspensions;
- to strengthen the effectiveness of the staff in developing a rapport with students of all backgrounds;
- to determine ways to establish and maintain effective school-parent relations; and
- to increase parent and community participation in school activities.

Several specific programs have been developed to meet these objectives. One program, believed by the human relations trainers to be one of the most important, consists solely of classroom demonstrations and observation. At the request of the teacher, a human relations trainer will do an in-class demonstration of how to better manage the students. The demonstrations may involve specific activities or exercises to include in the curriculum or various innovative teaching strategies. The trainer will typically continue to participate in the class instruction and to observe the teacher once a week for four to six weeks, depending on the teacher's needs.

Student communication workshops have also been organized by the human relations department. These workshops, usually involving between 20 and 25 students, some parents, and one or two teachers, are held during the school day at various locations, usually a church, community center, or hotel. Students are led through human relations exercises that are meant to increase trust and reduce threat among themselves and, particularly, among those of different ethnic and economic backgrounds. The teachers who attend are encouraged to continue the workshop exercises in the classroom.

At the beginning of the school year, the human relations trainers meet with the faculty in each school to provide an orientation to the programs that the department offers. The response to the programs has generally been favorable. Although many teachers were at first reluctant to admit their needs to administrators, this reluctance diminished as word of their value spread. Programs that have been offered by the human relations staff include the following:

- o individual consultations with teachers and administrators on classroom and school management problems;
- o demonstrations of multiethnic teaching materials;
- o parent communication workshops (often held at PTA meetings);
- o faculty workshops on human relations;
- o student bus safety training; and
- o drug and alcohol abuse counseling with students.

The School Improvement Resource Team

The second component of the district's staff development program is the school improvement resource team (SIRT), funded by a Title IV C ESEA grant. The team consists of elementary and secondary school teachers and administrators* who work with teachers, students, and parents on building-based desegregation-related problems. When SIRT was first organized in 1977, team members received extensive training in organizational development from a trainer on the faculty of a nearby university. Since their training, they have conducted workshops in both elementary and secondary schools.**

Although not all of the activities conducted by SIRT are desegregation-related, the majority have been. The team has helped school

---

*Team volunteers submitted applications and fifteen were selected by the coordinator of integration and the teachers' and administrators' unions. Team members are paid for the time spent in their own training and receive substitute days for the monthly meetings and other work performed during the school year.

**SIRT has been more successful in secondary schools than in elementary schools although the trainers are not certain why this is true. They guess that elementary teachers are more threatened by suggestions from other teachers and administrators and receive sufficient attention from the human relations trainers.

staffs and students improve their communication skills and minimize problems that have been encountered because of changing student populations. It has generally helped school staffs identify the problems upon which they should focus their activities.

Initially, the SIRT team meets with faculty at building staff meetings. Subsequently, the team asks that those interested in spending additional time on school problems meet, either after school or on weekends, to plan ways to alleviate the problems that exist. No stipend is given for participation.

ESAA Special Projects

PAGE and CASE are projects funded through ESAA special projects grants. PAGE, initiated in 1977 and run by teams of school counselors, benefits students and teachers in grades kindergarten through eight. PAGE teams assist teachers in developing guidance techniques. Classroom demonstrations on positive self-concept, self-awareness, decisionmaking, problem-solving, values, and career awareness are given when requested by elementary school teachers. Eleven schools are currently participating in the PAGE project.

Project CASE, first implemented during the 1978-79 school year, is operating in 18 elementary schools. Ten two-person teams consisting of a counselor and a media specialist assist children in grades 4, 5, and 6 to develop career goals, self-awareness, decisionmaking techniques, and problem-solving skills. The CASE teams work directly with each class for a minimum of 30 minutes each week. CASE staff conducts parent awareness meetings and teacher inservice sessions and develops supplemental instructional materials relevant to career and self-awareness.

The Integrated Education Program Workshops

The IEP, like the human relations program, offers human relations workshops for teachers and students. The program is the most long-standing of all the staff development programs for desegregation, having existed since 1967. Programs in cultural awareness and human relations are offered each year for teachers and students. The IEP is funded through the district's operating budget.

All programs offered through the IEP during the 1978-79 school year have been voluntary; many (e.g., classroom demonstrations) have been offered only at teachers' requests. During previous years, this was not the case. The desegregation plan mandated that all personnel participate in inservice once a month for five months. Teachers, administrators, and support staff were granted released time for these half-day meetings. Human relations topics were discussed during the sessions. Human relations trainers within the district, as well as staff of the department of intercultural relations in the State Education Department and the staff from the local Desegregation Assistance Center, conducted the workshops.

PLANNING THE STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

The planning of the staff development programs is shared by the central office administrators and trainers, teachers, parents, and students. At the beginning of each school year, the department of human relations distributes a one-page needs assessment form to all teachers, on which they are asked to indicate their needs, as well as those of the school and community. Teachers are also asked to note their preference for after-school workshops, workshops held along with pot-luck dinners for parents and faculty, or all-day faculty workshops at a location away from the district. When all the completed forms are received by the trainers, the department of human relations summarizes teachers' responses and plans activities around them.

Each elementary and secondary school has a human relations advisory committee. The committees, mandated by the desegregation order, vary in the extent of their activities. Those that perform their intended functions provide a vehicle for parents, teachers, and students to communicate their needs to the human relations staff in the central office. The committees foster student and faculty awareness of the importance of a human relations program and allow building input to the workshops offered by the human relations trainers.

The SIRT team, because its members are teachers in the different participating schools, believes their assessment of staff and student needs is sufficient to operate a successful program. Needs are assessed

informally in discussions among faculty and in building staff meetings. The problems voiced by building staff guide the planning effort. The staff and SIRT team work together at the start of the workshops to plan the topics to be covered and the activities that will best aid in problem-solving at the school.

The PAGE and CASE teams plan their inservice activities directly with the teacher whose class is being used for the demonstration. Teachers discuss their own and the students' needs with the teams and plan discussions and workshops around them. The progress of the teacher and the students is considered when deciding on the activities to be conducted in future sessions.

IMPACTS/OUTCOMES OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

The district's staff development programs have generally been regarded as successful. After an initial reluctance to ask for inservice, teachers have become more open to admitting their needs and the needs of their students. Because the format of the district's inservice activities is individual instruction for teachers rather than the large group sessions dominant in many other districts, the impact of the programs appears significant. Trainers generally work with teachers and students until the impact of the program is evident, until teachers feel they have improved their management and teaching skills and students show better communications with their peers and with their teachers. Teachers are given on-hands experience and practical skills that can be directly applied to their specific problems and needs.

The format of the district's inservice training has produced criticism as well. The resources available to provide the needed services are few. Trainers do not have adequate time to spend with each teacher or student requesting assistance. Each human relations trainer, for example, covers between six and twelve schools. With the size of building staffs ranging from 15 to 45 and with the number of students per building sometimes nearing 700, the time each trainer can spend on individual needs is minimal. Some teachers and students are necessarily bypassed.

The trainers believe classroom demonstrations are generally more effective than large- or small-group workshops. During classroom demonstrations, they believe, more attention can be focused on specific needs.

Most teachers agree with the inservice trainers, with only two of those interviewed indicating a preference for district-wide sessions. These two believed it important to share problems and experiences with others in the district who had difficulties in managing their classrooms, in encouraging student and parent communications, and in understanding the different cultural and economic backgrounds of their students.